

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1334

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1355

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1412

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1421

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1437

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1438

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1439

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1441

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1455

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1486

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1494

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

No. 03-1499

In Re: ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG,

Petitioner.

On Petitions for Writs of Mandamus.
(MISC-03-1, CA-96-87-2, CA-02-40, CA-96-855-2, MISC-00-50-1,
MISC-00-123-1, CA-01-827-1, MISC-03-7, CA-00-45, CA-99-71,
CA-95-434, MISC-99-71)

Submitted: June 5, 2003

Decided: June 23, 2003

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arthur O. Armstrong, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated petitions for a writ of mandamus, Arthur O. Armstrong seeks leave to proceed in forma pauperis. A litigant may proceed in any federal court without prepayment of fees if he files an affidavit showing he is indigent. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) (2000). However, the court may dismiss the action if it concludes that "the allegation of poverty is untrue or the action . . . is frivolous or malicious . . . [or] fails to state a claim." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (2000). After reviewing the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed in each mandamus petition, we conclude Armstrong is not indigent. Accordingly, we deny the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the petitions.

On May 8, 2003, by order to cause, Armstrong was ordered to show why he should not be sanctioned for filing frivolous mandamus petitions and enjoined from filing further actions. Armstrong filed a response claiming his mandamus petitions were not frivolous. After reviewing the petitions, we disagree. The mandamus petitions and numerous motions are frivolous. In lieu of particularized fees and costs and in light of Armstrong's utter disregard for the limited resources of this court, we order Armstrong to pay sanctions in the amount of \$500 payable to the clerk of the court, as we have done in similar cases. See In re Vincent, 105 F.3d 943 (4th Cir. 1997). In addition, we enjoin Armstrong from filing any

further mandamus petitions in this court until (1) the sanctions are fully paid, and (2) the court determines the action is not frivolous.

We deny Armstrong's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and we dismiss the mandamus petitions. We also deny all remaining pending motions. We sanction Armstrong and enjoin him from filing future mandamus petitions in accordance with this opinion. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED